

**Job No. 22192**

Written Response Required: NO  
Due Date: N/A  
Actionee: N/A  
Closes CCN: N/A  
OU: GW/VZ100  
TSD: N/A  
ERA: N/A  
Subject Code: 8830/4170

Environmental  
Restoration  
Contractor

# **ERC Team**

## **Meeting Minutes**

**CCN: 080346**

---

**SUBJECT** GROUNDWATER/VADOSE ZONE INTEGRATION PROJECT MEETING - JUNE 19, 2000

**TO** Distribution

**FROM** Michael J. Graham, Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project Manager

**DATE** June 19, 2000

**ATTENDEES**

See Attached List

**DISTRIBUTION**

Attendees  
GW/VZ Distribution List  
Document and Information Services H0-09

---

**NEXT GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT OPEN MEETING:**

Next Meeting: Monday, July 17, 2000 – 1-3 p.m.  
Location: Bechtel Hanford, Inc., Assembly Room (Badging Required)  
Local Call-In Number: (509) 376-7411  
Toll Free Call-In Number: (800) 664-0771

**MEETING MINUTES:**

A Groundwater/Vadose Zone (GW/VZ) Integration Project Open Meeting was held on **June 19, 2000** in Richland, Washington, at the Bechtel Hanford, Inc. (BHI) Assembly Room.

**PROJECT REPORT:****INTEGRATED PROJECT SCHEDULE UPDATE (provided at meeting) (Dru Butler)**

As Michael Graham is on vacation and Tom Wintczak is elsewhere, I am going to be running the meeting.

Looking at the schedule to date, the Congressional Report has been signed off. It is printed and ready to go today, and we will have it on the website tomorrow. Mary (Harmon), are you comfortable with our releasing that right away?

ANSWER: It hasn't gone through official signatures here yet. I would like to give it to Carolyn Huntoon first.

Okay. Let us know when you're ready.

ANSWER: I will.

QUESTION: We'll expect a call from you before we release it. Are you still using the PDFs or do you have hard-copy? Would you like us to send you a hard-copy?

ANSWER: Michael said he sent one to me on Friday.

Yes.

QUESTION: Is it being printed right now? We can send you as many copies as you need. How many should we send? 25?

ANSWER: That'd be good. I'll let you know if I need more. When I get a hard-copy I'll give it over to Carolyn and then it will go to Congress.

Maybe by the end of the week we'll be ready to release the report.

Mark Freshley will talk about the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) meeting coming up next week, June 28 – 30. The Interim Risk Characterization Report decisional draft will go to Congress March 8, 2000. It will be available for public review in the near future.

QUESTION: What is that report?

ANSWER: We set it in the context of System Assessment Capability (SAC) and how we will look at risk.

QUESTION: Does it identify receptors other than people?

ANSWER: Yes. In the context of SAC Rev. 0 assessment.

### **S&T Roadmap (Mark Freshley)**

As far as the NAS meeting, we are still working with NAS to establish a final agenda for the upcoming meeting, so we are not prepared to hand-out a final agenda at this time. Kevin Crowley will be contacting NAS early this week and nailing it down. The first day, as it is scheduled at this point, we will start out using the presentation that Wayne Ballard and Mike Hughes did at the Expert Panel (IPEP) meeting last month. Then, we will spend a session discussing the Hanford Waste Site. At 4:00 p.m., on the current schedule, there's an opportunity for comment from regulators and stakeholders. On the second day, there is a field trip. Several people have expressed an interest in going on that field trip. Please let us know if you want to go and we can make necessary arrangements for that.

QUESTION: Is this to look at Integration Project activities?

ANSWER: It's a site tour with a focus on the Integration Project activities. We are stopping at a number of different sites – the remediation site, the tank farm, the experimental transport field study site. It's a full day. If people want to join us, we need to know in advance.

Friday we've scheduled a series of break-out sessions – inventory, vadose, Columbia River, SAC team.

QUESTION: Does the inventory include releases?

ANSWER: We've got a separate task putting together how different waste types are released. In most cases, it's treated simply. For example, the release model for tank. Those are the kinds of concerns for the release model that we've got.

The agenda for the NAS meeting should be out on the NAS website this week.

QUESTION: Will NAS produce reports like IPEP?

ANSWER: The NAS doesn't work the same way as IPEP. They are going to produce a report at the end. The meeting in June and another in September are used as information gathering meetings. There is another meeting in November, at which time they will begin writing. There are also options for additional meetings in January and March. After all that, they will produce one report.

COMMENT: That is the way the NAS operates, across the board with all projects.

QUESTION: Do you have contact with them periodically to get a feel for how they are going with it?

ANSWER: There's not a lot of contact. If they call us, we can talk to them. But, we are not to call them. They are volunteers and they are not paid for their time. In general, there is very little interaction.

They have strict procedures. They will submit their review report to peer review before they release it.

The other item is the update of the S&T Roadmap. The 45 day public review period closes J July 21, 2000.

### **ISSUES TRACKING (Bruce Ford)**

At this time, we are in a transitioning from the System Assessment Capability leading the efforts to resolve technical issues to the Characterization of Systems as the lead. Characterization of Systems had to establish a team to deal with issues. We accomplished

that about a month and a half ago.

We began regular meetings of the group by reviewing current issue resolutions by beginning to discuss about how to transition. There are six technical element leads involved in that. We also have involvement from Sandia National Laboratory, Joe Schelling is here now. The group specifically from the Hanford Technical Community is focusing on understanding the issues and talking about them in terms of how they would likely effect the transition from SAC Rev. 0 to SAC Rev. 1. We have to factor this information into the Detailed Work Plan (DWP). We haven't completed that evaluation, we're just getting people up to speed. We have a meeting Wednesday to discuss this further. We'll continue meeting on a weekly basis until we feel it's no longer necessary to meet weekly.

Another significant activity to mention is a meeting in Portland with Oregon Office of Energy. Mike Thompson, Steve Sautter, and I attended. A number of topics were discussed. Comments from that meeting focused in several areas – access to the website and information contained on the site. Some good suggestions about how to make it easier to get to the issues database. There were also comments on how we could improve the ability to provide feedback. We talked in particular about how Oregon viewed our responses. They had six categories as to how they viewed our responses. It wasn't a complete analysis, and we asked Oregon to provide a more detailed analysis. They committed to going back and providing an evaluation of where they thought we stood as well as a prioritization of the issues.

Mike Thompson: I thought it was a positive meeting. There was a lot of give and take. Oregon had some positive things to say. There was some discussion on the 618-11 tritium issue.

QUESTION: How many issues are in the system? And, how many originate in Oregon?

ANSWER: There are about 90 in the system, and approximately 60 come from Oregon.

QUESTION: Is there a huge amount of detail involved?

ANSWER: Yes.

QUESTION: Are some set aside for future investigation?

ANSWER: Yes. We're approaching it with the consideration as to whether they apply to SAC Rev. 0 or how they apply. We're doing further assessment. We are considering whether it's an issue we need to address and a timeframe of when we need to address it.

QUESTION: How many issues could be put into a basket labeled transport/effects?

ANSWER: The SAC group drafted responses. A large number of those 90 issues have responses drafted. We are trying to identify which ones are critical to resolve in short order and which can be resolved later. That's the process we're going through now.

COMMENT: I get the feeling that Oregon would simply like to prove that Hanford can't be modeled successfully.

ANSWER: I don't think it would be appropriate for us to speak of motivations. They have some tough issues that need to be resolved.

QUESTION: That brings up an issue that's bothered me for some time. Are any similar grants being made to any Tri-Cities organization like the grant for Oregon? I know Tridec gets some assistance and the Hanford Communities get public participation funding from Ecology. I'm a little concerned that there is no assistance, other than volunteer efforts for Tri-Cities groups. This disparity bothers me. I see Tribal funding and they hire all kinds of professionals to present their official position. If the Tri-Cities has a comparable effort, I don't see it. I don't mean that in a bad light for the project. I will be exploring this at greater length with the U. S. Department of Energy (DOE). I feel we're being a little taken advantage of.

COMMENT: Your position is noted.

#### **IPEP Subcommittee Meeting (Bob Bryce)**

The IPEP Subcommittee meeting is Tuesday and Wednesday, June 20-21. Dr. Ed Berkey, Dr. Kavanaugh, Dr. Karr and Dr. Mel Marietta from Sandia will be here. We are going to get feed-back from them on the utility of SAC Rev. 0 and improving the tool itself. What improvements are needed to develop the SAC tool so that it can be used in a more significant way in Hanford decisions? There will be discussions on analyses to be performed, software testing. Dr. Ed Berkey asked that we give some examples of what the results might look like. We'll be using plume maps, trend maps, and existing site data. We have put together a presentation of proposed uses of the initial results. The agenda for this meeting is included in your packet today. In the late afternoon, there will be an opportunity for stakeholder and regulators to comment on the design document, plans for SAC Rev. 0 and SAC Rev.1. We can block out times for people to speak, if they let us know they want some time.

We've asked this sub-committee to come back with immediate feed-back the second day. They will take a couple of weeks to write out their comments. They will consider stakeholder and regulator comments in their report. Dr. Berkey suggested that it would be very helpful to them if you would write out any comments you have.

COMMENT: At this point, I'll be listening to get better educated.

COMMENT: My primary view of what the expected results of this meeting should be is activate bells and whistles. It should point the way to the next stage of work.

QUESTION: On terms of expected results, cancer to humans is number one, what does the rest of the list look like?

COMMENT: The details of the analyses to be performed are in the design document. Additional data is needed for the non-cancer health effects. Argonne National Lab has proposed pulling together data on other health impacts.

Identifying ecological impact areas and cultural impacts are also included.  
We'll talk through those tomorrow. There will be a discussion on that.

COMMENT: The panel will have most of the day for presentation and, then, the rest of us will follow with comments. I'd rather have it give and take all day long.

There is a chance to have that. I'm guessing there won't be a big crowd. In a smaller group, there's more of a chance to interact.

As in the IPEP meetings, people from the audience are recognized for discussion on each topic.

COMMENT: That's not early in the presentation, that's usually later.

COMMENT: Since Dr. Karr is going to be here, I hope we get some good leads on how to tackle the environment ecosystem effects.

He's been awfully quiet.

### **RPP Assessments (Fred Mann)**

We started slant drilling under tank SX-108 and have taken a sample at the base of the tank. All the contamination is right at the interface. They kept drilling down. The second sample was lost. Whether that was lost because it was too dry, or because of cobbles, we don't know yet. In the process of losing it, we did contaminate the casing in the ground. We are spending some time decontaminating. Field readings indicate it's 100 mr/hr outside the lead shielding. The sample itself is considerably higher, 4 r. If we get any hotter, we will have to think about what we are going to do next. This area is about where we predicted the highest gamma dose readings. We are hoping this is a high point and that it will get lower. The first sample was sent to the lab. It's not moist. Heat from the tank would tend to dry it out. There is no lab analysis yet.

QUESTION: Was the hot sample above the dry sample?

ANSWER: The most radioactive sample was 15 feet below the tank. The other sample was the first sample at the base of the tank. We're assuming that all samples are incredibly hot. We use public roads and have to be very careful.

**Upcoming Events:**

July 3, 2000, is our next scheduled meeting. It will be cancelled because of the July 4<sup>th</sup> holiday. We'll see you July 17, 2000.

COMMENT: The agenda says the IPEP meeting is next week. I just want to point out that it's tomorrow.

Okay, any other questions or comments?

Thank you everybody.

**NOTES:**

GW/VZ Web Site location: <http://www.bhi-erc.com/vadose>

If you have questions or comments please contact Dru Butler (509-375-4669), Gary Jewell (509-372-9192), or Corinne Conry (509-372-9192)

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- 1) Agenda of IPEP Subpanel SAC Rev. 0 Management Review, June 20-21, 2000.
- 2) GW/VZ Integration Project Two Month Look Ahead Calendar

**ATTENDEES:**

Martin Bensky – Tri-Cities Caucus

Bob Bryce – PNNL

Dru Butler – BHI

Bruce Ford – BHI

Mark Freshley – PNNL

Dib Goswami – Ecology

Mary Harmon – DOE-HQ

Alison Kent – BHI

Fred Mann – FFS

Shri Mohan – Ecology

Gordon Rogers – HAB

Virginia Rohay – CHI

Steve Sautter – BHI

Mike Thompson – DOE-RL



***Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project  
Integration Project Expert Subpanel Meeting  
Review of Assessment Design for the  
System Assessment Capability, Rev 0  
June 20-21, 2000  
3350 George Washington Way  
Richland, Washington***

**- AGENDA -**

**BECHTEL BUILDING ASSEMBLY ROOM**

**TUESDAY, June 20**

**Moderator**

<b>7:30 – 8:00</b>	<b>On Your Own Coffee From Columbia River Coffee House</b>	
<b>8:00 – 8:15</b>	<b>Welcome, Objectives and Ground Rules for the Review</b>	E Berkey
<b>8:15 – 8:45</b>	<b>Objectives of Initial Assessment using SAC, Rev. 0</b>	R. Bryce, C. Kincaid
<b>8:45 – 9:45</b>	<b>Analyses to be Performed</b>	C. Kincaid, A. Bunn
<b>9:45 - 10:30</b>	<b>Software Requirements</b>	W. Nichols
<b>10:30 - 10:45</b>	<b><i>BREAK</i></b>	
<b>10:45 - 11:30</b>	<b>Software Design/Testing</b>	W. Nichols
<b>11:30 - 12:30</b>	<b>Expected Results</b>	C. Kincaid, A. Bunn
<b>12:30 - 1:15</b>	<b><i>LUNCH (on your own)</i></b>	
<b>1:15 - 2:15</b>	<b>Proposed Uses of Initial Assessment Results</b>	R. Bryce
<b>2:15 - Open</b>	<b>Opportunity for Stakeholder, Tribal Nation and Regulator Input and Comments</b>	E. Berkey

**BECHTEL BUILDING ASSEMBLY ROOM**

**WEDNESDAY, June 21**

**Moderator**

<b>8:00 – 10:00</b>	<b>Subpanel Only - Working Session</b>	
<b>10:00 – 12:00</b>	<b>Management Review Comments and Recommendations</b>	E. Berkey

*GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT*  
**JUNE 19, 2000 – AUGUST 31, 2000**  
*TWO MONTH LOOK AHEAD CALENDAR*

<b>June 19</b>	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m. (Contact: Dru Butler)
<b>June 20-21</b>	GW/VZ IPEP Subpanel review of SAC Rev. 0 Design Report Richland, WA (Contact: Bob Bryce)
<b>June 28-30</b>	NAS Committee Meeting on Hanford S&T Richland, WA (Contact: Mark Freshley)
<b>July 3</b>	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting *CANCELLED* Due to Independence Day
<b>July 11</b>	HAB Environmental Restoration Committee Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 8 a.m.-4 p.m.
<b>July 17</b>	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m. (Contact: Dru Butler)
<b>August 7</b>	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m. (Contact: Dru Butler)
<b>August 15-17</b>	Review ERC DWP with RL/BHI Management, Regulators, and DOE-HQ
<b>August 21</b>	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m. (Contact: Dru Butler)

**Current Public Comment Period:**

**May 15-July 5, 2000**

System Assessment Capability (Revision 0) Assessment Description, Requirements, Software Design and Test Plan

**June 6-July 21, 2000**

S&T Roadmap Revision 1